



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Taylor to the cause, into the service of which Mr. Marshall has so violently enlisted them.

Mr. Marshall devotes another chapter to the patristical testimony for Purgatory. Our readers will judge of the fairness with which his list is made out, when we tell them the first name on his list of uninspired witnesses. It is a great father, Mr. Marshall tells us, who flourished, A.D. 51, the disciple and convert of St. Paul—who do you suppose?—Dionysius the Areopagite!! The quotation, to be sure, is not much to the purpose; but just fancy any one at the present day, with the slightest pretensions to learning, seriously quoting, as the work of a Father of the first century, such an exploded forgery as the works of Dionysius the Areopagite. We can scarcely conceive it possible that Mr. Marshall was not aware of the character of the work he was citing; and we fear his conduct, in this respect, is only of a piece with his ingenious quotation from Jeremy Taylor.

It will be supposed that a writer either so ignorant or so dishonest as this, does not deserve any serious refutation, nor should we have devoted an article to him but for the very curious line of argument which he pursues in his first chapter, and which we think deserves to be made known to our readers. We should add, too, that it is not Mr. Marshall's own invention, but taken by him from popular French writers; and it is, therefore, not uninteresting to learn the views as to the character of their religion maintained by Roman Catholic writers in so influential a country as France, and which are thought worthy of being translated for the benefit of Roman Catholics of this country, and have been received by them with such favour as to pass to three editions.

In order to explain these views, we must begin by reminding our readers that many Protestant writers (see, for example, Middleton's letter from Rome) have been struck by the resemblance of some of the rites and practices of Romanism, to the old superstitions of heathenism. They have pointed out how Christians came to be placed under the temptation to pervert the simplicity of their religion, in order to accommodate it to the prejudices of their heathen friends, so as to enable those, for example, who were addicted to the use of images or to the worship of deified mortals, to combine these practices with the profession of Christianity. Protestant writers have pointed out the great similarity between the controversy which they have to conduct with Roman Catholics, and that which the early apologists for Christianity had to conduct with the heathen. The defenders of Paganism asserted that they did not pay direct worship to images, though they used them in their religious services—that they worshipped one supreme God, although they invoked the assistance of other inferior beings. The advocates of Christianity, on the other hand, rejected these apologies as insufficient, and condemned the use of images as absolutely unlawful. It would lengthen this article too much were we to attempt to enumerate the various points of resemblance that have been traced between modern Romanism and ancient Paganism. This is a subject, on which, until of late years, Roman Catholic writers have not been very fond of touching. In our times, however, they have found courage to grapple with it. We quoted in our number for October last, the defence of the Roman Catholic system, given by the French writer, M. Beugnot. He distinctly admits the fact, that great changes were made in the Christian religion in the fourth and fifth centuries, but defends them as part of a wise and necessary policy, employed in order to gain over the heathens into the Church; he endeavours to show, that the system which has grown into Romanism, originated in a compromise between Christianity and Paganism, essential, in his opinion, to the success of the former religion. We shall not now stop to inquire what is to be thought of those who represent the Founder of our religion as so ignorant of human nature as to leave it to the worldly policy of his followers, some hundreds of years after his departure from the world, to supply those deficiencies in his scheme, without which his doctrines could never have obtained universal diffusion. It is the less necessary to expose M. Beugnot's errors, as he has been far outdone by the French writers, whom Mr. Marshall has followed in the work before us. While other Roman Catholics have endeavoured to conceal, or to deny the resemblance between Romanism and Paganism—while M. Beugnot endeavours to account and apologize for it—Mr. Marshall triumphantly calls attention to the many points of similarity between the religion of the Roman Catholics and that of the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Chinese, the Tartars, the North American Indians, &c., and concludes, that these people were all evidently better Christians than Protestants.

It does not, at first sight, appear obvious why the similarity of Roman Catholic notions to those of the heathens, should be an argument in their favour. The following sentence, which contains Mr. Marshall's notions on the subject, will hardly be thought satisfactory by any one who is not convinced beforehand that the Roman Catholic doctrines are true:—

"Whether the Pagans received this doctrine by patriarchal tradition and from Noah's own lips, before the dispersion, which is most likely, or whether they learned it in after days, from the Jews, through the medium of their philosophers, or whether, in fine, it was a law engraved upon their hearts by God's own finger, is immaterial as to the subject under discussion."—p. 9.

We have already given the reader to understand, that the particular doctrine which Mr. Marshall endeavours to prove to be handed down from Noah, is that of Purgatory; but he does not confine his labours to this point, and endeavours, in passing, to clear his friends, the heathens, from the charge of polytheism, which has been rashly brought against them.

"The Pagans in giving the generic name of all spirits, did not, however, give equal honour to all. 'We say, once for all,' observes a celebrated writer,* 'to those of our readers who have not studied antiquity, that the ancients, not even excepting the Jewish people, gave the generic name of Gods to all the celestial and infernal spirits, and even to men whom they canonized. It is still very common in Asia, Africa, and America; but, notwithstanding this, they at all times know well how to distinguish amongst the celestial gods, the God supreme, uncreated and Creator. They, like the Catholics, adored one God; like them they honoured the angels, like them they paid a secondary respect to the saints, and that has always been the case; so that, on these points, they were more Christian than the Protestant sectaries.' [!!!] 'There is a marked analogy; adds another writer,† between the gods of the Pagans and our angels; between their deified heroes and our saints. No one can deny the existence of the celestial spirits that God employs in the government of the world; it is, in like manner, certain that the angels are not of a nature so different from man, that the latter should not associate with them after death, when he merits it by his virtue. Such has always been the belief of mankind.' Celsus, as quoted by Origen [sic] speaks precisely in the same manner (lib. 7, v. 68). Therefore, the Pagans, though calling all the heavenly and infernal spirits, as well as their heroes and geniuses, gods, were not polytheists."—Marshall, p. 5.

We have to thank Mr. Marshall for the pains he has taken to establish a point we have often dwelt on (see, for example, volume ii., page 21)—namely, the similarity between the pleas now offered by the Roman Catholics in defence of their system, and those which the heathens put forward of old. If Roman Catholics are in the right, it is certainly quite true that the Pagans were much better Christians than Protestant sectaries, and it might be added, than the Christian writers of the first three centuries. But if the defenders of Christianity in early times were right in rejecting those pleas which the heathen put forward in defence of their image-worship and their polytheism, are Protestants wrong in refusing to admit them now?

We come now to notice some of Mr. Marshall's testimonies on the subject of Purgatory. We quote first his remarks, which are rather curious, on the fact that the heathens, some of them, believed in the transmigration of souls, as a sort of preparatory purification of souls—

"It is not surprising that such a popular error as the transmigration of souls should have made its way into a mere matter of opinion. I say a mere matter of opinion; for it never has been yet defined, even in the true Church, where Purgatory is, or in what its pains consist, &c., &c. So that we are at liberty, as much as the Pagans, to entertain our own views upon those subjects, without infringing upon an article of faith. All the Church requires of us to believe concerning Purgatory is, 'that there is such a place, and that the souls therein detained are relieved by our prayers and good works, but more especially by the holy sacrifice of the Mass.' Now, these essential points are found in the doctrines of the Pagans, notwithstanding the diversity of their opinions as to the manner, time, and place of the punishment; and if fault is to be found with them for their discrepancy on this head, Protestants should be the last in the world to reproach them with it."—Marshall, page 4.

We dare say that many of our Roman Catholic readers will be surprised to learn that their Church allows them so much latitude of opinion on the subject of Purgatory—that even if they held the transmigration of souls they would retain all that is essential in their Church's doctrine. But we feel that if Mr. Marshall had been half as charitable to the Protestants as he is to the Pagans, he might have discovered that they, too, hold all that is essential in the doctrine of Purgatory. We, too, are willing to admit "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful." The time and place of Purgatory are confessedly non-essential matters, and the only difference is, that we place our Purgatory in this world, and maintain that the only time when souls are purified must be on this side of the grave.

We must, in conclusion, give a few specimens of the manner in which Mr. Marshall collects the testimonies of all nations to "the essential parts" of the doctrine of Purgatory. We need not repeat what he says as to the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Babylonians, and others, who are said to have believed in the transmigration of souls. We pass on to the testimony of the Romans. We have already quoted (vol. ii., p. 58) the account given by Virgil of his Purgatory, thinking, in the simplicity of our hearts, that it was some presumption against the truth of the doctrine, that a statement, made by a heathen, of the doctrines of the heathen religion—of the religion of false gods

—should serve so exactly to express the doctrine of the Church of Rome now. Mr. Marshall, however, takes a very different view of the case, and quotes Virgil with great relish, concluding thus (p. 14)—"The Romans believed in three distinct places for souls after this life; they practised piety, and offered prayers and sacrifices for those whose sins were expiable. They could not do more had they been orthodox Christians." He tells us, also (p. 12)—"The people of the Thibetans was founded by Magog, the grandson of Noah, by Japhet, and inherited the sacred traditions of the patriarchs, through which they not only believed and practised all that was essential with regard to Purgatory, but even celebrated *All Souls' Day*, and perfectly coincided with our Saviour's idea of heaven, 'there are many mansions in my Father's house,' and of hell, where each shall suffer according to the number of his crimes."

We give next Mr. Marshall's account of "the savages" (p. 16)—"It can be asserted that nothing is better observed among the savages in general, than respect for the dead. The women burn offerings on the tombs, and consign to the flames all the substance of the deceased. [What savage waste—why not give them to the priests?] They believe that they can appease the souls with the effusion of blood. The inhabitants near the river Palmas celebrate the anniversaries of their dead, and the relatives of the deceased accompany the ceremonies of these anniversaries with many incisions on the body, from which blood abundantly flows. The savages, therefore—yea, the wild, naked, and ignorant red savages of North America—are more orthodox upon this and many other essential points of Christian faith than many of the sanctimonious and Bible-reading Protestants of this enlightened country."

From the North Americans Mr. Marshall passes to the Turks. He says (page 17)—"The veneration that the Mussulmen entertain for Mahomet, does not prevent their being more Christian than a multitude of other Protestants. They have preserved many dogmas, institutions, and practices which were rejected by Protestants. Besides the belief in a Purgatory, we shall mention the devotion to guardian angels, the intercession of saints, the veneration for their tombs and for their relics, pilgrimages, profound respect for the writings of the holy doctors, the monastic orders, the lent, &c., &c."

It would be tedious were we to go through the other nations which Mr. Marshall has adduced as witnesses for Purgatory; enough has been said to show in what respectable company he claims to hold the doctrine. We add, in conclusion, the peroration with which Mr. Marshall concludes this branch of his subject. Any of our readers who are familiar with the style of French eloquence, will recognise, with patriotic gratitude, that the nonsense we have been copying is not of home manufacture.

"Enough, Jews! enough, Gentiles! Natives of the earth, 'tis enough! The immense unanimity of your testimonies, in diffusing itself all over the wide world, has submersed all incertitude, elevated itself above the highest exigencies of logic—the unique, the perpetual, the universal existence of this dogma is established now and for ever. People of the tombs—venerable manes of those nations that have slept for ages—return in peace to the cities of the dead, to the realms of the departed; the dogma which ye have so much honoured and cherished is fully satisfied with this last homage that ye have given to it, and the mementoes of which shall long be present to the grateful memories of the living."

HISTORY OF THE POPES—No. III.

THE TENTH CENTURY CONTINUED.

IN resuming the history of the Popes of the tenth century (the last part of which appeared in our number for November) we ask our readers to remember—*firstly*, that we are not selecting instances here and there, but giving the history of all the Popes of that century in their order; *secondly*, that we are not giving the history from any Protestant writers, but from the famous and learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in their great work on the Councils, in which they have given the history of the Popes also; *thirdly*, that wherever the Jesuits find it in their power to praise a Pope, we give that praise in full. So our readers may safely take the history, as the most favourable that can be given of the Popes.*

POPE LEO VI.

"Leo, the son of Christopher the chief secretary, the sixth of this name, was made Pope about the end of the year of Christ 928, in the time of Constantine the Emperor. In the following year, being cast into prison, he died, after six months and fifteen days.† But how he died, or for whose wickedness he was imprisoned—his own, or his successor's—the Jesuits do not tell. A Pope being cast into prison was, in that age, too common a thing (as our readers must have learned from our November number) to excite much attention.

POPE STEPHEN VII.

This is the same called Stephen VIII. in Bishop Milner's list, which we gave in our November number; but

* La Religion Constatée, par M. De La Marne, n. iii., p. 112, c. 5, vol. i.

† L'Abbe Foucher Mémoires de L'Académie des Inscriptions, tom. xxxv., p. 23.

* To save space, we give the Latin only where we might be suspected of having an object in misrepresenting. The edition of Labbe and Cossart used by us, is that printed at Paris, A.D. 1674.

† Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 566.

the Jesuits count him Stephen VII. Strange that Roman Catholics cannot agree about who were Popes, and who were not! "Stephen, a Roman by nation, the son of Theudemund, the seventh of this name, was appointed in the room of Leo VI., in the year of our Lord 929, in the time of Constantine and Romanus, Emperors of the East; who, when he had sat two years, one month, and fifteen days, departed this life." And that is all they have to say of him. But let us have patience; the life of his successor will be more full.

POPE JOHN XI.

"John, the son of his father, the false Pope Sergius, by the strumpet Marozia, was intruded into the place of Stephen by the power of Wido, Marquis of Tuscany, and of his mother, Marozia, in the year of Christ 931, in the time of Constantine and Romanus, Emperors of the East—at which time he could not yet have been capable by age of so great a dignity, even though no other impediment stood in the way.† Artaldus, a most holy man, who, from being a monk, was elected Archbishop of Rheims after the boy of fifteen years of age was cast out, would never have sought the pall from a monster of this kind, had he not thought so highly of the name of Roman Pope, that he thought that name was to be honored even in a man unworthy and unlawfully appointed, and had persuaded himself that the Apostolic See was to be judged by none but by God."‡

We trust that our readers will observe, that such reverence for the name of Pope, and such a doctrine that "the Apostolic See" cannot be judged by man, is a poor security for the Church, when it leads archbishops, "most holy men," to bow down before such a monster, acknowledging him as head of the Church, and Vicar of Christ. But to proceed with the history of Pope John XI.—"Alberic, his brother, together with his mother, Marozia, kept this Pope enthralled in prison to the day of his death. Marozia offered the dominion of the city to Hugo, brother of her deceased husband King Wido, if he would promise that he would make a confederacy by marrying her. Hugo accepted the condition, and, having entered the citadel of St. Angelo by stealth, after incest committed with the widow of his brother, he despised the Romans; he knocked down his stepson Alberic, whilst, by the command of his mother, Marozia, he poured water on her hands, as if he poured out too much of it. Which injury that he (Alberic) might avenge, he stirred up the Romans to revolt; and after the citadel was stormed, as Luitprand says, he put to flight his incestuous father-in-law, Hugo; but he ordered his mother, Marozia, with his brother, the fallen Pope John, to be detained in prison, in which the violent invader, violently cast down, died, after he had not so much ruled as foully defiled the Apostolic See for five years and some months."§

A family quarrel worthy of such a family! But what an account of how a Pope was appointed, and how he died! Yet this "monster," as the Jesuits call him, is counted by Bishop Milner as a lawful Pope, as a Vicar of Christ, who performed his duty as such IRREPROACHABLY, and as a step in the apostolic succession, by which the title of the present Pope must be proved!

POPE LEO VII.

This Pope sat three years and six months. The Jesuits tell us nothing of him, except that he got Odo, Abbot of Clugni, to settle the above-mentioned family quarrel and boxing-match between Hugo and Alberic.

But they relate a fact which happened in his pontificate, and added not a little, they say, to the troubles of the Church. Manasses, Bishop of Arles, seized upon the dioceses of Verona, Trent, Mantua, and Milan, in addition to his own; and Manasses said he was only following the example of St. Peter, who was Bishop of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria at the same time! But if St. Peter must answer for all that has been done in his name, he will have a heavy account.||

* Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 590.

† The birth of this John is mentioned in the life of Sergius III., given in our November number. If this John was born, as it would appear, after Sergius was made Pope, he could not have been more than 29 years of age when made Pope himself. Father Paul Sarpi says he was but 20.—Treatise on Eccl. Benefices, ch. 19.

‡ Johannes Patre Sergio pseudo-pontifice ex sortito Marozia prognatus, Widois Tuscis Marchionis et Marozie Matris potentia in locum Stephani intruditur, anno Christi 931, tempore Constantini et Romani imperatorum orientaliū, quo ipse nondum per ætatem tantæ dignitatis capax esse potuisset etiam nullum aliud impedimentum obstaret. Artaldus ex monacho Rheimensi Archiepiscopus electus, vir sanctissimus, post puerum illum quinquennale ejectionem, ab ejusmodi monstro pallium nequaquam petiisset, nisi tanti ipse fecisset Romani Pontificis nomen, ut etiam in homine immerito et illegitime collocato illud honorandum esse putasset, sedemque apostolicam a nemine, preterquam a Deo, judicandam esse sibi persuaderet.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 590.

§ Hunc pontificem Albericus frater una cum matre Marozia custodie mancipatum usque ad diem obitus detinuit. Marozia Hugoni Regis Widois defuncti mariti germano urbis dominium obtulit, si ille suo se conjugio confederandum promitteret. Acceptavit conditionem Hugo, et clanculo arcem sancti Angeli ingressus, post incestum cum relictis fratris uxore commisit, Romanos deiecit, Albericum privignum suum, dum jussu matris Marozie aquam manibus ejus infunderet, quasi immoderate effudisset, in faciem cecidit. Quam ut ille injuriam ulcisceretur, Romanos ad defectionem commovit, postquam aliquem impugnavit, ut ait Luitprandus, Hugonem Vitricum suum incestum fugavit; Matrem vero Maroziam, una cum fratre Joanne pater-papa mandavit detineri sub custodia, in qua violentus invasor violenti defectus oblit, postquam sedem apostolicam quinque annis et aliquot mensibus non tam rexisset, quam tuum iniquitasset.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 591.

|| Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 593.

POPE STEPHEN VIII.

This Pope is called Stephen IX. by Bishop Milner. We cannot expect much in the history of this Pope, on account of an ugly accident which happened to him. Labbe and Cossart say "he was elected by the Romans, the votes of the cardinals having been set aside.* His accident is thus related—"This Pope was deformed in the face by many sacrilegious blows, by the tyrants, whose hatred he had excited against himself on account of his election."† It is commonly thought that his nose and ears were cut off. The effect of these injuries on him is thus related—"And although these brands, inflicted for righteousness' sake, by the ministers of Satan, were not a disgrace, but an ornament, yet, from this cause, he abstained as much as possible from the public assemblies of men."‡ Nothing is harder to bear than personal shame; and the Pope could not think the loss of his nose an ornament. Father Paul says he never after appeared in public.§ So he shut himself up for three years and four months, and then died, leaving no farther materials for history.

POPE MARINUS II.

Marinus was made Pope in the year 943. The Jesuits say, that twenty-three years before, when Udalric was coming to Rome, this Marinus foretold to him the death of his predecessor, Adelbero, and that Udalric should be his successor. The character and conduct of Marinus is thus described—"He applied himself wholly to composing the Church, by the reformation of the clergy as well as of the monks, and by the restoration of churches and the care of the poor; by his letters he accomplished that peace should be established between Christian princes contending with each other."||

Such a Pope was, indeed, wanted; and a heavy task he had to perform. But he only sat three years and six months. "In his time," the Jesuits say, "the image of Christ, the Redeemer, miraculously impressed, and sent to King Agbarus, was removed to Constantinople, when Edessa was besieged by the Romans, in the year 946." This "miraculous image" was one of the many lying stories which the Church of Rome has helped to impose upon the world. Perhaps no Roman Catholic would now be found who would undertake to say that this miracle really happened; yet it is related as a true miracle by these most learned Jesuits, and the story did its work for the Church of Rome in its day. Well, at least, when one lying story is proved false, the Church of Rome can always get up another—witness the winking picture of Rimini, and the apparition of La Salette.

POPE AGAPETUS II.

No facts are related of him, but that he decided a contested election to the Archbishopric of Rheims; gave a pall to Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne; and confirmed the privileges of the Church of Hamburg, on occasion of the conversion of the Danes. His history thus concludes—"when he had well discharged his pastoral office, during nine years, seven months, and ten days, he departed this life."¶

POPE JOHN XII.

John, the son of that Alberic who ruled over the city (of Rome), invaded the Apostolic See, in the year of our Lord 955, in the time of the Emperor Constantine VIII.; and although the lawful age, and ALL OTHER THINGS which are required in a lawful Pope, were wanting in him, yet (the consent of the whole clergy afterwards accruing to him) it seemed that he was rather to be tolerated, than that the Church should be divided by any schism, which otherwise would have arisen; and since the universal Catholic Church knew that it was a less evil to bear a head, however monstrous, than that one body should be cut in two and deformed with two heads, she venerated him as a true and lawful Pope throughout the whole world.**

This is so important in relation to that doctrine of the Church of Rome, which teaches that the Pope is the head of the Church, and that it is necessary to salvation to be subject to this head, that we shall keep it to be considered in a separate article; so we proceed now with the history of John XII.

"He truly is the first Pope that is met with who changed his name, which, on account of his tyranny, changed but not forsaken, he wished to be called John, instead of Octavianus. His father, Alberic, called his son Octavianus with a view to the temporal dominion of the city: but he, on the contrary, having obtained the pontificate and the

* Posthabito Cardinalium suffragio, electus est a Romanis.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 599.

† Hic a tyrannicis, quorum odium propter sui electionem in se concitavit, crebris ictibus sacrilegis facie deformatus fuit.—Same reference.

‡ Et quoniam hæc stigmata propter justitiam a Satana ministris inflicta, non dedecori, sed ornameto essent; tamen ipse a publico hominum congressu hac de causa ut plurimum abstinuit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 599.

§ Treatise on Eccl. Benefices, ch. 19.

|| Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 609.

¶ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 618.

** Joannes Alberici illius qui urbi dominabatur filius, apostolicam sedem invasit, anno Domini 955, tempore Constantini VIII. imperatoris. Et quoniam huic legitima ætas aliæque omnia deessent quæ in legitimo pontifice requiruntur; tamen accedente postea consensu totius cleri visum est, hunc potius esse tolerandum, quam ecclesiam schismate aliquo, quod aliquo exitum fuisse, dividendam. Cumque

spiritual dominion of the whole world, wished to be called by this name of John."*

This name, JOHN, signifies "the grace or mercy of God." But the Popes of this name have been the most graceless of all—as if God would thus show the falsehood of the pretences of Popes. In this century alone, so far as we have gone, in the space of 40 years—Pope John X. was appointed solely through his infamous connection with a vile woman; Pope John XI. was the son of another Pope, by a strumpet, and was chosen Pope for that very reason; and, now, a Pope, who was "wanting in everything required in a lawful Pope," must call himself John XII! And in this Pope we find the origin of the custom, since become universal, of Popes changing their names at their appointment. Another mark of the succession of modern Popes being derived through these monsters of iniquity. The Jesuits go on to relate the wars in which Pope John XII. engaged; the oath of allegiance which he took to the Emperor; how he broke his oath, and fled to avoid punishment; how the Romans swore never again to appoint any one Pope without the Emperor's consent; how the Emperor held a synod, in which John was degraded from the Papacy, and Leo VIII. appointed a "false Pope;" and how Pope John, on the departure of the Emperor, returned and deposed Leo VIII. as an adulterer and invader of the See. But the death of Pope John must be related in their own words—"Concerning the unhappy end of Pope John, the author, who is said to be Luitprand,† writes these things—"On a certain night, as he was delighting himself with the wife of a certain man, he was so struck by the devil on the head, that within the space of eight days he died of that wound," not because, as he says, being justly condemned, he was unjustly received (into the Papacy), but because being admonished by God so often, and with so great troubles, he did not abstain from his accustomed sins."‡

One would suppose that a Pope would be justified from the charge of habitual adultery, and of being killed in the act of adultery, if it were possible; but the Jesuits do not undertake to deny the story, nor do they think it of any consequence to do so; they say expressly that they "do not dispute the truth of this story, in as much as these things bring no damage to the Catholic faith, concerning which we confess, with unanimous consent, that Peter, and the successors of Peter, after the promise of Christ received, could fail in morals indeed, but not in faith!"§

When our readers shall hear that distinction put forward again by Roman Catholic writers, we trust they will remember what great necessity the Roman Church had to invent that distinction. For be it remembered that this Pope John XII. is in Bishop Milner's list of the succession, through which the title of the present Pope must be proved; and it was, of course, necessary to maintain, that a Pope, "in whom all things were wanting that are required in a lawful Pope," who lived in "habitual adultery," might yet perform "his public duties," as Vicar of Christ, IRREPROACHABLY!

How did our Blessed Saviour prove that the Jews were the children of the devil? we find it in the 8th chapter of St. John's Gospel—"whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (verse 34); "ye do the deeds of your father" (verse 41); ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do."—verse 44. We think Roman Catholics cannot deny that a man who professes to live in holy virginity, and yet lives and dies in habitual adultery, does the lusts of the devil, and is a child of the devil; yet, according to the doctrine we are now considering—viz., "that a Pope may err in morals, but not in faith"—such a child of the devil may "perform his public duty, in preserving the faith and unity of the Church irreproachably;" as Bishop Milner says, all these monsters of iniquity in the 10th century actually did!—End of Controversy, letter 28, cent. x.

But if no degree of moral iniquity, or profligacy, or depravity can hinder a man from performing the office of Pope irreproachably, so long as he cannot err in faith, why might not the evil one himself prove an irreproachable head for the Church of Rome? St. James says—"the devils BELIEVE and tremble." The devil knows, with the greatest certainty of conviction, that Christ is the son of the living God; that Christ was born of a virgin, and was made man; that He died for our sins, and rose again; and that He will come to judge the world. The devil believes with the highest degree of conviction, and he trembles! Could Pope John XII. do more?

We ask our readers to consider what objection there

* Hic revera primus est inventus, qui sibi nomen mutavit, quique ex Octaviano, pro mutata non exuta tyrannide, voluit Ioannes nominari. Ob temporale urbis dominium, Albericus patre filium suum Octavianum nominaverat; ille e contra pontificatum et spirituale dominium totius orbis consecutus, spirituali nomine hoc Ioannis appellari voluit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 640.

† This refers to a history of the Popes which passes under the name of Luitprand, but which was not written by him.

‡ De infasto Ioannis pape exitu, autor qui asseritur Luitprandus hæc scribit; quidam nocte extra Romam dum se cum ejusmodi viri uxore oblectaret, in temporibus adeo a diabolo esset percussus, ut infra diem octo spatium eodem sit vulnere mortuus. Non quia, ut ille ait, iuste damnatus, iniuste receptus fuerit; sed quia tot tantisque vexationibus a Deo admonitus, a peccatis consuetis non abstinuit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 641.

§ Veritatem eorum non controverto, utpote quod nullum dispendium afferant fidei Catholicæ, de qua unanimi consensu præstiterunt, Petrum Petrique successores post acceptam Christi promissionem, in moribus quidem, non autem in fide deliquisse posse.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., 641.

could be to it, if the maxim that "the Pope may err in morals but not in faith," be sufficient to show that John X., John XI., and John XII., and many more such Popes, were duly qualified to perform the office of Vicar of Christ irreproachably.

We shall conclude the history of the Popes of the tenth century in our next number.

THE USE OF FORMS OF PRAYER.

WE have, in another article, given our readers one specimen of a Roman Catholic controversialist; but as it is our principle always to deal with the *best* arguments, and the most formidable opponents we can find arrayed against us, we consider it right to introduce them, also, to a higher class of Roman Catholic writers. We are, indeed, ready to acknowledge the marked increase that has taken place of late years in the ability of their controversial publications. Much of this improvement, no doubt, is owing to the accession which their ranks have gained in some recent converts from Protestantism; men (our Maynooth friends will forgive us for saying) of a higher education than has usually adorned the Romish priesthood, and who besides, as deserters, possess the advantage of knowing the exact points against which to direct their fire; or, to speak without any metaphor, of knowing the difficulties most likely to be felt by Protestants, and the arguments most likely to tell with them.

We have before us now a little bundle of controversial tracts, in which we think we do not mistake in saying we observe traces of Protestant education. We select for review that on the "Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary," partly because we have no doubt its statements as to Roman Catholic opinions and practices will convey real information to many Protestant readers on points of which they were ignorant; partly because its line of argument has been reproduced—whether by the same or a different writer—in a late (the November) number of the "Rambler."

We take from the "Rambler"—which is the most concise—the following statement of the difficulty which the writer professes to encounter:—

"In the Rosary, we must first remind our Protestant readers, the 'Hail Mary' is repeated one hundred and fifty times; the 'Our Father,' ten times; and the 'Glory be to the Father,' ten times. Frequently only one-third of the whole is said at once; but the proportion of the three prayers remains the same. This is, at least, the case with that which is commonly called 'the Rosary,' or 'The Rosary of the Blessed Virgin,' for there are others constructed on different plans. This Rosary is, also, the most universally in use of all Catholic popular devotions. It is said repeatedly by every Catholic, from the Pope downwards. Indeed, on an average, it is scarcely too much to state that one-third of the whole is said almost daily by every devout Catholic above the age of childhood.

"Now, all that non-Catholics know of this devotion is, that for every *Pater Noster* and *Gloria Patri* we say ten *Ave Marias*. Is not the deduction inevitable that we think ten (or, rather, five) times as much of the Blessed Virgin as of Almighty God? Or, to be extremely charitable, that we pray five times as often to Mary as to our God and Saviour? So, at least, the world has decided against us.

"But what is the fact? The fact is, that this is not the Rosary which we say, and that no such Rosary exists at all, or was ever heard of in the Catholic Church. The doctrine of the Rosary consists in meditations *with the understanding and the heart* on the chief events of the life and passion of Jesus Christ, and the great blessings of the Gospel, while, *with the lips*, we recite all these Hail Marys, *Lcd's Prayers*, and *Doxologies*."

As we think it possible some of our Protestant readers may be so stupid as not to perceive, on the first reading, the exact point of this defence, we hope to make the matter more clear to them by laying before them the explanation of the use of forms of prayer, which we have learned from Roman Catholic writers. Our readers are aware that differences of opinion prevail among different denominations of Protestants on the question whether extempore prayer is preferable to the use of forms in public worship. They know, also, that the Church of Rome not only agrees with the Church of England in the use of public forms of prayer, but that she carries the use of forms in private devotions to a much greater extent than is common among the members of the reformed Churches. The following extract (from the tract on the Rosary), however, will prove that members of the Church of Rome are not insensible to the force of some objections that may be urged against the use of forms:—

"The defect of this method of devotion is, that in saying words composed by others, we must ask exactly for what they express, and sometimes they will not quite express our own feelings. Sometimes, perhaps, we are ashamed to utter words of absorbing self-abasement, when we are conscious that our own sense of contrition is less deep; or it may be the words before us are all full of joyful love, and we would only be lying at the foot of the cross, crushed and humbled under the intolerable sense of sin. Then, again, our wants are so various, one could not find prayers to meet them all. Sometimes they are very distinct, growing out of the cares of to-day—the little things which belong to our own life, but which may seem unim-

portant to other people—difficulties and temptations which may not occur to other minds, but are very grave and real to us. Sometimes, again, they are not so clear and definite. There are feelings which others cannot understand, and which, perhaps, we do not well understand ourselves. Nothing it may be, but a weariness, and the sense of a great need. It is not that we have this or that to ask for in particular, but we feel weak, and fretful, and unhappy; we desire only to kneel down in God's presence and let him see all our hearts, and then the best-chosen phrases of other men seem stiff and empty. We do not seek for words; or, if any are needed, let them be such as will mould themselves to the fashion of our own unutterable thoughts.

"Surely all must know what I mean, that there is often a consciousness of sin impossible to confess, and a sense of prayer impossible to put into any set form of words. We may try to use our own, chosen at the moment; if so, how difficult it is to select those that are right and good! Sometimes we say the same thing over and over again; sometimes, try as hard as we may, what we say does not express our meaning—it vexes us that our words should be so vague and indistinct, and we puzzle ourselves to find better; and so, in thinking for right expressions, we lose time, and our thoughts get distracted."

Here, then, are some objections, forcibly stated, to the use of forms of prayer—at least in private devotion. How are they to be got over? How are the confessed advantages of forms to be reconciled with the elasticity of extemporaneous prayer? The secret consists in knowing how to use forms in the right manner. We have already given our readers the key to the enigma, and, therefore, without further mystery, announce to them, that the *proper way of employing forms of prayer is to use the forms with the lips while the thoughts are occupied with something else*.

Some of our Protestant readers will think this strange, and will, perhaps, find it hard to believe that such advice has been given by Roman Catholics; but if they will reflect for a moment, they will remember, that in the Roman Catholic Church the public service is conducted in Latin—a language not understood by the people—that it is absolutely impossible for them to follow, with their thoughts, the words of the service, and that all that can be expected of them is, that they should occupy their minds, during the time of worship, with some kind of holy and prayerful thoughts, by no means, however, necessarily corresponding to the words uttered by the officiating minister. Nor is this confined to persons ignorant of Latin. A Protestant clergyman, a few years ago, paid a visit to Rome, directing his particular attention to the religious ceremonial, and has published an account of what most struck him. One of the points he noticed, which appeared to him most remarkable was, that the non-officiating clergymen, at the different churches, were almost invariably engaged, during the time of divine worship, with their private books of devotion, that no two of them were occupied in the same study, and that scarcely any one dreamed of following the service actually being performed. Mr. Seymour merely records faithfully what he saw, without giving any theory to account for it, as we are now in a position to do. Our readers, then, must learn, that there are three kinds of attention which may be given to prayer. The first kind is, when you follow the words of the prayer, and attend to their meaning. This is the lowest kind of attention, and almost any one is capable of it. The second kind is, when your heart is filled with the spirit of prayer, without particular attention to the words employed. The third kind is, when you attend to the words, and have the spirit of prayer too. This last kind of attention is, undoubtedly, the best, but is of such a kind that only a few exalted souls are capable of it.

We take the above statement of doctrine from Father Baker's work, "Sancta Sophia," quoted as a standard authority by Mr. Faber, in his book, "All for Jesus," from which we have already made several quotations. We think it better to give our readers Father Baker's own statement of his doctrine—"Now, whereas, in all manner of prayer, there is necessarily required an attention of the mind, without which it is not prayer, we must know that there are several kinds and degrees of attention, all of them good, but yet one more perfect and profitable than another; for—1st, there is an attention, or express reflection on the words and sense of the sentence pronounced by the tongue, or revolved in the mind. Now, this attention being, in the vocal prayer, necessarily to vary and change, according as sentences in the Psalms, &c., do succeed one another, cannot so powerfully and efficaciously fix the mind or affections on God, because they are presently to be recalled to new considerations or succeeding affections. This is the lowest and most imperfect degree of attention, of which all souls are, in some measure, capable; and the more imperfect they are, the less difficulty there is in yielding it; for souls that have good and established affections to God, can hardly quit a good affection by which they are united to God, and which they find gustful and profitable for them, to exchange it for a new one succeeding in the office; and, if they should, it would be to their prejudice.

"The second degree is that of souls indifferently well practised in internal prayer, who, coming to the reciting of the office, and either bringing with them, or by occasion of such reciting, raising in themselves an efficacious affection to God, do desire, without variation, to continue

it with as profound a recollectedness as they may, not at all heeding whether it be suitable to the sense of the present passage which they pronounce. This is an attention to God, though not to the words, and is far more beneficial than the former; and, therefore, to oblige any souls to quit such an attention for the former, would be both prejudicial and unreasonable; for, since all vocal prayers, in Scripture and otherwise, were ordained only to this end, to supply and furnish the soul that needs with good matter of affection, by which it may be united to God, a soul that hath already attained to that end, which is union, as long as it lasts ought not to be separated therefrom, and be obliged to seek a new means, till the virtue of the former be spent.

"A third, and most sublime degree of attention to the divine office is, that whereby vocal prayers do become mental—that is, whereby souls, most profoundly, and with a perfect simplicity, united to God, can yet, without any prejudice to such union, attend, also, to the sense and spirit of each passage that they pronounce—yea, thereby find their affection, adhesion, and union increased, and more simplified. This attention comes not till a soul be arrived at perfect contemplation, by means of which the spirit is so habitually united to God, and, besides, the imagination so subdued to the spirit, that it cannot rest upon anything that will distract it. Happy are those souls—of which, God knows, the number is very small—that have attained to this third degree; the which must be ascended to by a careful practice of the two former in order, especially of the second degree."

Those of our readers who have mastered the theory of attention here laid down, are now in a position to understand the great advantages of the Rosary, and the wise simplicity of what they may have deemed its vain repetitions. If your thoughts are not to be particularly occupied with the meaning of what you are saying, what possible advantage can there be in giving utterance to long and varied forms of prayer? Is it not far more simple to take some short form—such as the *Pater Noster* or the *Ave Maria*—and repeat it over fifty or a hundred times, or as often as may be necessary, filling your thoughts the while with meditations as holy and as profitable as you are able?

But some of our Protestant friends may here object, and cry out, to what purpose is the use of any words at all. "We have no doubt," says the "Rambler," "that to those who are not Catholics this appears a most extraordinary and preposterous device. They will ask, what can be the possible use of saying one thing, and meaning another? and, in all probability, will flatly deny that we ever do what we pretend, reiterating their conviction that the whole thing is a nonsensical piece of gabbling and muttering—at once unscriptural and irrational. Now, we do not deny, that were a person who is not a Catholic to attempt to say the Rosary in the way we have described, he would be completely baffled in his efforts. When a man has little or none of that inward power by which we realize the objects of our faith, and when he has never been habituated to the peculiar ways of Catholic devotion, he would find the Rosary the most unspiritual and the most tiresome of prayers."

The "Rambler" proceeds to explain the utility of an apparatus or device by which bodily or outward motions may be made subservient to the operations of the mind. We have all heard of children who could not repeat the verses they had learned by heart, unless they were constantly buttoning and unbuttoning their sleeve buttons; of orators who, if not allowed a string to fiddle with, were sure to lose the thread of their discourse; of sailors who cannot go to sleep unless the wind is blowing, while landmen will be awake all night because there is a gust every quarter of an hour.

"Just such is the use of the 'Hail Marys' and other prayers of the Rosary. From childhood a Catholic is accustomed to associate the great mysteries of faith with the low, monotonous murmur from his own lips and those of others of those forms of prayer, and with the mechanical movement of the hands in passing the beads along with the fingers. Even when the custom is not begun in childhood, a short practice confers the necessary unconscious mechanical facility of both lip and finger; and those who, as Protestants, regarded the whole thing as incomprehensible, or laborious, or childish trifling, acquiesce, with delight and gratitude, in the unerring wisdom of the Church that has sanctioned so admirable and so simple a means for drawing the thoughts away from the glare and gloom of this life and its agitations."

"The string of beads he holds in his hand is simply to assist his memory, and prevent him from losing his place and getting confused in the repetition of the same words so many times. His great object is to keep his mind constantly fixed upon the subject before him; therefore, he is very glad of anything that prevents distraction, and tells him the proper number of prayers has been said without his having to count them, and think whether there is not one more yet to say, which would in a moment take his thoughts off from the presence of God. The touch of the beads, without disturbing him, reminds him of the proper time to change the form of prayer, and when he is to pass from one point of meditation to another. In all this it is the object of the Church to assign some fixed limits to our meditations, though she allows us ample freedom within them. We need discipline in prayer quite as much as in everything else."